REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending and stand rejected. In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and pass the application on to issuance.

Initially, it is noted that the Examiner has misconstrued the Applicant's arguments from the prior response filed October 26, 2005. The Examiner stated that the Applicant argued that the prior art reference "does not disclose launching a browser if a predetermined event has occurred." To the contrary, the applicant argued and continues to argue that the prior art reference does not disclose launching a browser **or service to a particular network location** if a predetermined event has occurred.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC §102: Claims 1-14 were rejected under Section 102 as being unpatentable over USPN 6,906,813 issued to Tuchitoi. Upon completion of a print job, Tuchitoi teaches sending a job completion notice event to an address included in the completed print job. When the completion notice event is received, the utility 205 at the address displays a pop-up dialog and informs the user that printing of the print job is complete using the graphic user interface. Tuchitoi, col. 13, lines 1-34. In doing so, Tuchitoi's utility 205 only uses data included in the notice event. The utility is not launched to a network location.

Claim 1 directed to a method for launching a browser or other service and recites the following acts:

1. determining if a predetermined event related to activity of a web or network service has occurred; and
2. sending a command to a system to launch the browser or service to a particular network location if the predetermined event is determined to have occurred.

The Examiner argues that

Tuchitoi teaches a system and method for launching a notification to the user in case the a print job has been completed (see col. 13 lines 1-34 and fig. 5). However the claim states "sending a command to launch a browser or service" in response to the predetermined event. Tuchitoi teaches launching a notification message on the client machine that is "launching a service" in response to a print complete "predetermined event" and therefore Tuchitoi meets the scope of the claimed limitation "sending a command to launch a browser or service".

The Examiner's argument ignores the specific language of Claim 1 that recites "sending a command to a system to launch the browser or service <u>to a particular network location."</u> The Examiner only argues that Tuchitoi teaches launching a service. The Examiner does not contend that Tuchitoi teaches launching a service to a particular network location as recited by Claim 1. Tuchitoi only teaches sending a completion notice event to an address. A utility at that address receives the completion notice event and displays a pop-up dialogue containing information received in the completion notice event. That utility is not launched to a particular location.

Consequently, Tuchitoi does not teach or suggest sending a command to a system to launch the browser or service to a particular network location if the predetermined event is determined to have occurred as recited by Claim 1. For at least this reason, Claim 1 is patentable over Tuchitoi as are Claims 2-9 which depend from Claim 1.

Claim 10 is directed to a program product that includes a computer useable medium having machine readable program code that when executed, implements the method of Claim 1. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so are Claim 10 and Claims 11-13 which depend from Claim 10.

Claim 14 is directed to a system capable of implementing the method of Claim 1. For the same reasons Claim 1 is patentable, so is Claim 14.

S/N: 09/940,596
Case: 10007688-1
Response to Office Action

CONCLUSION: Claims 1-14 are felt to be in condition for allowance. Consequently, early and favorable action allowing these claims and passing the application to issue is earnestly solicited. The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

Shell S. Simpson

By _____

Jack H. McKinney
Reg. No. 45,685

January 26, 2006

S/N: 09/940,596
Case: 10007688-1
Response to Office Action